

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 15, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohri (US Patent 6,515,669). Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohri in view of Rafii et al. (US Patent 6,512,838).

By this Amendment, Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 15.

**Preliminary Matters**

Applicants note that the Examiner has yet to indicate that the drawings filed on June 29, 2005 are accepted. **Therefore, Applicants hereby request the Examiner indicate their acceptance in the next Office Communication.**

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

*Claims 1, 2, 15, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohri (US Patent 6,515,669).*

The Examiner provides the same basic rejection of the independent claims as was provided in the previous Office Action, dated November 24, 2008. Therefore, the following comments will be mainly directed toward the Examiner's Response to Arguments, found on page 6 of the instant Office Action.

The Examiner disagrees with the argument that Mohri fails to disclose "configuration of the 3D input device based on the recognition results." Specifically, the Examiner argues that "Mohri uses hand shape detection to generate a **control command** based on the recognition

results. The Examiner concludes that a control command is a type of configuration which is more specific than the configuration recited in the independent claims of the instant application. The Examiner also disagrees with the argument that Mohri's configuration does not change regardless of the finger and hand positioning, arguing that the different processing modes disclosed in FIG. 15 and at col. 11, lines 41-54 indicate that the configuration is changed based on hand shape input.

After reviewing and considering the Examiner's arguments, Applicants submit that Mohri fails to disclose "adaptively configuring the 3D input device corresponding to signals which are provided from the plurality of the finger devices worn by a user, by using information of the recognized finger positions of the finger device" recited in amended claim 1. The control command identified by the Examiner is not a *configuration* of the 3D input device, but is a *function of a configuration* of the 3D input device. A control command in Mohri is identified by recognizing a particular hand shape. However, the configuration of the 3D input device in Mohri remains for every possible identifiable hand shape. On the other hand, according to an exemplary embodiment of claim 1, an identical hand shape will result in differing control commands, each control command being determined by the *adaptive configuration* of the 3D input device corresponding to signals which are provided from the plurality of the finger devices worn by a user, by using information of the recognized finger positions of the finger device. Thus, the Examiner's indication that a control command identified in Mohri corresponds to the configuration recited in claim 1 appears to be misplaced.

Further, the different processing modes identified by the Examiner do not identify different configurations of the 3D input device, but merely indicate that different inputs may be used based on different finger positions. However, the resulting control command does not appear to change based on the different inputs, and thus, as noted in the previous paragraph, the configuration of the 3D input device does not corresponding to signals which are provided from the plurality of the finger devices worn by a user, by using information of the recognized finger positions of the finger device, as the configuration of the 3D device in Mohri remains unchanged.

Additionally, claim 1 is amended to recite “recognizing finger positions of the finger device representing positions of fingers by which the finger device are worn” and “adaptively configuring the 3D input device corresponding to signals which are provided from the plurality of the finger devices worn by a user, by using information of the recognized finger positions of the finger device.” Neither *Mohri* nor *Rafii* discloses or suggests this distinctive feature of amended claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art. Claim 15 recites limitations similar to claim 1, and is patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1. Claims 2, 16 and 25 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

*Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohri in view of Rafii et al. (US Patent 6,512,838).*

Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are dependent from claims 1 and 15. Because Mohri fails to disclose each of the elements of claims 1 and 15, and because Rafii fails to cure the deficiencies

noted with respect to claims 1 and 15, claims 3-6 and 17-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Dion R. Ferguson  
Registration No. 59,561

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 13, 2009